## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraphs have been amended on pages ???.

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 5 and 6 are currently being amended, whereby the scope of these claims has been unaffected by these amendments.

Claims 13-16 are currently being added.

This amendment adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-16 are now pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,114 to Geaghan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,069 to Abato et al.; claims 2-3 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan et al. in view of Abato et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,469 to Nounin et al.; claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan et al. in view of Abato et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,222,463 to Rai; and claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan et al. in view of Abato et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,254 to Shoji et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

With respect to the teachings of Abato, this reference teaches the use of embedding URL information in non-video portions of a video signal that a user receives, so that the user's computer can access web sites via the URLs in the URL information in order to display video information obtained from the web

sites at appropriate times while the user is viewing the video that had the URL information embedded in it. This is clearly much different from the teachings of the claimed invention, in that in Abato, the user is actually receiving video data, and the user's computer is then directed to particular web sites in order to retrieve video information to be played along with the video data that the user is currently receiving (such as from a cable TV channel). See column 6, lines 1-10 of Abato, for example.

In the present invention, in contrast, a communication system of the claimed electronic whiteboard communicates to individuals or computer devices within its locality the network location of the data store (which stores images that are recorded on the surface of the electronic whiteboard). In Abato, there is no locality per se, since the users are all retrieving information output from a central location at respective remote sites (e.g., via a cable TV system), and thus all of the remote sites are not local with respect to the central location.

Furthermore, if one was to combine the teachings of Geaghan with those of Abato, this would not result in the present invention. Geaghan discloses a computer that stores information input to a whiteboard, whereby that information can later be retrieved by users from the computer in which that data is stored. If one was to somehow incorporate the teachings of Abato into those of Geaghan, one would obtain a computer system that would output video data corresponding to inputs to the whiteboard, to users via a network connection, whereby those users would also be directed (via the embedded URL information) to other websites which store pertinent information that is in some way relevant to the information input to the whiteboard. The remote users of this combined system of Geaghan and Abato would have to know beforehand the URL of the whiteboard data store, since that is akin to knowing a particular cable TV channel output from a cable TV provider in the system of Abato. What the user would not know is the other relevant websites that provide information pertinent to the website of the whiteboard data store, but this is clearly different from the website of the whiteboard data store itself.

Thus, the combination of Geaghan and Abato, if such references could be combined, does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in the presently pending claims.

Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that column 32, lines 23-32 of Geaghan teaches a communication system for communicating to individuals or computing devices within its locality the network location for the data store. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Column 32, lines 23-32 of Geaghan merely discloses that a view program may be invoked from time to time to view and manipulate images recorded by a recorder. This has nothing at all to do with a communication system for communicating, within its locality, to a network location of a data store. The Examiner is requested to provide a more detailed basis for this rejection based on column 32, lines 23-32 of Geaghan, if this rejection is maintained in a future Office Action.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record. Presently pending independent claim 10 recites similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and thus claim 10 is also patentable over the cited art of record.

The presently pending dependent claims are patentable due to their respective dependencies on either base claim 1 or base claim 10, as well as for the specific features recited in those claims. For example, with respect to claim 2 and claim 11, the Office Action relies on the teachings of Nounin et al. to discloses the use of a beacon for emitting a signal from which a network location associated with a data store can be derived. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Nounin et al. discloses a system having a first base station 101 connected to the network for providing a bi-directional channel at low transmission speed, a second base station 103 connected to the network for providing a high speed down-link channel, and a terminal device 105. See column 8, lines 24-40 of Nounin et al.

In Nounin et al., "call origination is requested to a first base station through a first radio channel for enabling bi-directional radio communication in a

specific terminal out of plural terminals having four addresses; that is, a first physical address including the serial number of each terminal, a first logical address including the subscriber's telephone number, a second physical address as hardware protocol of communication between computers, and a second logical address as software protocol of communication between computers. The first physical address is used for a radio communication system such as the PHS and includes the serial number of each terminal. The first logical address is also used for the radio communication system such as the PHS and includes the subscriber's telephone number. The second physical address is used for radio communication between computers and is stored in a communication hardware which is installed in the terminal. The second logical address is also used for radio communication between computers and is converted into the second physical address by using an address table." See column 7, lines 3-23 of Nounin et al.

It is clear from the above portion of Nounin et al. that the terminal itself provides information as to whom it seeks to call (e.g., where it wants to retrieve information from), and thus Nounin et al. does not teach or suggest a beacon for emitting a signal from which the network location associated with a data store can be derived.

Accordingly, dependent claim 2 is patentable for this additional reason.

New claims 13 and 15 have been added to recite a "bar code" feature that is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited art of record, alone or in combination.

New claims 14 and 16 have been added to recite that the signal output by the beacon also includes a data file name, so that a user can obtain a particular data file from a plurality of data files stored in the data store. Such a feature is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited art of record, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, since there are no other objections or rejections raised in the Office Action, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _____June 14, 2004_____          _____Phillip J. Articola_____

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY          Phillip J. Articola
Customer Number: 22879          Registration No. 38,819
                                Telephone:   (202) 672-5300
                                Facsimile:   (202) 672-5399